

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/840,208 04/23/2001		Christiaan Jacob Martens	NL000217	7398
75	590 02/05/2003			
Michael E Marion U.S. Philips Corporation			EXAMINER	
580 White Plair	ns Road		GLASS, CHRISTOPHER W	
Tarrytown, NY 10591			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2878	
			DATE MAILED: 02/05/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	Advisory Action	09/840,208	MARTENS ET AL.			
	·	Examiner	Art Unit			
		Christopher W. Glass	2878			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address					
	THE RAPLY FILED 21 January 2003 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.					
j	PERIOD FOR REPLY [check either a) or b)]					
	a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection.  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In oevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).					
	1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.					
	2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:					
1	(a) they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);					
İ	(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);					
	(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or					
	(d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.					
	NOTE:					
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):						
	4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).					
	5.⊠ The a) affidavit, b) exhibit, or c) request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> .					
	6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.					
	7. ☐ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.					
	The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:					
	Claim(s) allowed:					
	Claim(s) objected to:					
	Claim(s) rejected: <u>1,3-6,9,10</u> .					
	Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
	8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.					
	9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s)  10. Other:  STEPHONE ALLEN PRIMARY EXAMINER					
	Patent and Trademark Office O-303 (Rev. 04-01) Advisor	ry Action	Part of Paper No. 10			





Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: the limitations of the amended claim 1, (comprising "the cross-section of the mirror assembly varies from a smallest to a largest cross-section along its longitudinal axis"), as well as the limitations of dependent claims 3-6 and 9, are unpatentable over the movement detector disclosed in the Keller reference, in view of the teachings of Chang (see rejection of claims 1 and 8 appearing in previous Office Action mailed 11/27/02, as well as Figures 1-3 of Keller and Figures 3 and 4 of Chang); the limitations of claim 10, (comprising "a method of installing a movement detector in a space...the arrangement being such that the mirror assembly extends essentially through the ceiling") are unpatentable over Keller, in view of the teachings of the Yung reference, which discloses a ceiling-moutable motion detector, according to the reasons stated in the previous Office Action (see Figure 3 of Keller; Figures 1,2,5,6 and Column 2, lines 50-53 of Yung).